



Fermilab

# MINERvA Working Group Meeting

August 10, 2005

1:30 – 2:30 PM

Snake Pit

# Agenda

- 1) Present and discuss Dave's Updated Draft Project Management Plan (Dave and All)
- 2) Discuss contingency and what goes in the MOU/SOW (Ed)
- 3) Present and discuss another MINERvA with TEC < \$5M scenario (Nancy and Others)
- 4) Status of Other Action Items from 27-July meeting
  - a. Dave to incorporate comments on PMP into present PMP draft.
  - b. Steve to check with HEP on the requirements for reporting on an under 5M\$ project and get back to MINERvA management.
  - c. MINERvA project management to meet with G. Bock & R. Plunkett to talk about 3.5-4M\$ packaging of MINERvA. (Done on 7/28.)
  - d. Suzanne to get Mont's and CD person's signatures on present MOU/SOWs as needed. (Mont's signatures were given on 7/28, Suzanne in contact with Bob Tschirhart for CD.)
  - e. MINERvA project management to work with FNAL management to determine signatures needed on future MOU/SOWs (namely construction ones).
  - f. Ed & Dean & MINERvA project people to add TJ and Suzanne to this meetings mailing list.
  - g. Mont to check on under 5M\$ that we don't need CD0 and just have one CD
  - h. Mont to come up list of membership for the PMG.

# Contingency Email

----- Original Message -----

**From:** [Suzanne Pasek](#)

**To:** [Ed Temple, Jr.](#) ; [dhoffer@fnal.gov](mailto:dhoffer@fnal.gov)

**Cc:** 'Deborah Harris' ; 'Nancy Grossman'

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 03, 2005 11:27 AM

**Subject:** MINERvA - who holds the contingency

Hi Ed & Dean,

MINERvA is working on MOUs and SOWs for FY05 & FY06 and a question about contingency came up. For BTeV (and now NOvA) I've heard the phrase that the Project "owns" or controls the contingency, but apparently that wasn't the case for NuMI. I wasn't sure if this is the preferred approach for newer projects, or if it had something to do with NuMI being a line item.

Nancy suggested that I ask you to clarify this for us, perhaps at the next MINERvA PMG. I'll be out of town, but I can read the meeting notes to see the details when I return.

Thanks,  
Suzanne

# Contingency Email (continued)

----- Original Message -----

**From:** [Ed Temple](#)

**To:** [Suzanne Pasek](#) ; [dhoffer@fnal.gov](mailto:dhoffer@fnal.gov)

**Cc:** ['Deborah Harris'](#) ; ['Nancy Grossman'](#)

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 03, 2005 11:53 AM

**Subject:** Re: MINERvA - who holds the contingency

Suzanne et al

It is my preference that "the Project 'owns' or controls the contingency." That's how it's been on projects I've been on (eg Advanced Photon Source, \$800M, at Argonne; Spallation Neutron Source, \$1.4B, at ORNL). These situations are still subject to the Change Control Thresholds and Approval process. Furthermore the Project "owning" contingency means the Project Manager "owns" the contingency held in a single pot not distributed or "owned," or entitled to in any way by the subprojects. (Sometimes a 'contingency analysis' is put together by making estimated contingency needs at the subproject level in support of establishing the cost baseline. However, that does not mean that the subprojects "own" any contingency. Some will perform to the baseline or better "creating" even additional contingency. Some may not meet the cost baseline goal and will be allocated contingency through the change control process. Furthermore, unforeseen events (eg inflation, scope changes, etc) may make calls on contingency.) Therefore, the MOUs initially distribute only funds in support of a subproject base estimate not including contingency.

I think on NuMI Ron Lutha claimed the Fermi Site Office "held - owned" the contingency. This was because he felt he needed to make the case to DOE Inspector General and GAO auditors that he "DOE was in control of the project." I think in our meeting last week Steve Webster said the appropriated MINERvA funds would be "allocated" to Fermilab in a single chunk including contingency. That would be consistent with "the Project 'owns' or controls the contingency," as stated above.

However, things might unfold differently as the project evolves. Just keep alert.

Sincerely,

Ed.

# Action Items

- a) Dave to incorporate comments on PMP into present PMP draft.
- b) Steve to check with HEP on the requirements for reporting on an under 5M\$ project and get back to MINERvA management.
- c) MINERvA project management to meet with G. Bock & R. Plunkett to talk about 3.5-4M\$ packaging of MINERvA. (Done on 7/28.)
- d) Suzanne to get Mont's and CD person's signatures on present MOU/SOWs as needed. (Mont's signatures were given on 7/28, Suzanne in contact with Bob Tschirhart for CD.)
- e) MINERvA project management to work with FNAL management to determine signatures needed on future MOU/SOWs (namely construction ones).
- f) Ed & Dean & MINERvA project people to add TJ and Suzanne to this meetings mailing list.
- g) Mont to check on under 5M\$ that we don't need CD0 and just have one CD
- h) Mont to come up list of membership for the PMG.

TOTAL PROJECT COST (TPC)		≥\$400 million	<\$400 million to >\$100 million US Delegated to SC-1	≤\$100 million to >\$5 million	<\$20 million to >\$5 million	≤\$5 million
DECISION/APPROVAL						
Prior to CD-0, Mission Need Statement		Reviewed by OMBE-ME-20 and approved by SC-1				N/A
Prior to CD-1, Acquisition Strategy		Reviewed by OMBE-ME-90 and approved by SC-1				N/A
CRITICAL DECISIONS	Approve Mission Need - CD-0	S-2	SC-1	SC-1	SC-1	N/A or FPD
	Approve Alternative Selection and Cost Range - CD-1	S-2	SC-1	SC AD	PM or SOM if delegated	N/A or FPD
	Approve Performance Baseline - CD-2	S-2	SC-1	SC AD	PM or SOM if delegated	N/A or FPD
	Approve Start of Construction - CD-3	S-2	SC-1	SC AD	PM or SOM if delegated	N/A or FPD
	Approve Start of Operation - CD-4	S-2	SC-1	SC AD	PM or SOM if delegated	N/A or FPD
CHANGE CONTROL	SAE - Deviation	S-2 if change in Performance Baseline of ≥6 months or ≥\$25 million or 25% of TEC/TPC or change in scope that is not in conformance with the Project Data Sheet				N/A
	Program - Level 1	SC-1	SC-1	SC AD	PM or SOM if delegated	N/A
	Project - Level 2	PM, SOM or FPD (Opt)	PM, SOM or FPD (Opt)	PM, SOM or FPD (Opt)	PM, SOM or FPD (Opt)	PM, SOM or FPD (Opt)
	Contractor - Level 3	Contractor	Contractor	Contractor	Contractor	Contractor
Project Execution Plan Approval		SC-1	SC-1	SC AD	PM or SOM if delegated	N/A
Environmental Impact Statement Record of Decision/Site Selection		S-2	S-2	S-2	S-2	S-2
External Independent Review (EIR), Independent Project Review (IPR), or Operational Readiness Review (ORR)		EIR Prior to CD-2 & CD-3 IPR Prior to CD-0 ORR Prior to CD-4	EIR Prior to CD-2 IPR Prior to CD-3 ORR Prior to CD-4	EIR Prior to CD-2 IPR Prior to CD-3 ORR Prior to CD-4	EIR Prior to CD-2 IPR Prior to CD-3 ORR Prior to CD-4	N/A
PARS Reporting (EVMS for Projects >\$20 M)		Monthly Project Status After CD-0				
		Monthly Project Performance After CD-2				
Quarterly Project Performance Review (QPPR)		Quarterly Project Performance Review After CD-0				

FPD=Federal Project Director; AD=Associate Director; SOM=Site Office Manager; PM=HQ Office of Science Program Manager; US=Under Secretary  
 S-2=Deputy Secretary; SC-1=Director, Office of Science; ORR=Operational Readiness Review (SC); EIR=External Independent Review (OECM)  
 IPR =Independent Project Review (SC)

#### Office of Science Project Decision/Approval Matrix